REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005 for the above-captioned application. In light of the following remarks reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects all claims 7-13 as supposedly obvious over US pat. 6,553,500 to Sterzik et al. ("Sterzik") in view US pat. 5,475,295 to Hong ("Hong") and in further view of the background section of the present application or, as the Examiner characterized it, "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art."

So far as the undersigned is aware, the Examiner has not pointed to anywhere in Sterzik that discloses the limitations: "at least two power supply unit controllers"; "a scaling value"; "a power supply unit serial number"; "communication means that are responsive to a request"; "storing a value associated with an output supply level"; "storing a scaling value"; or "storing a power supply unit serial number."

In an effort to supply some of the above claim limitations that are missing from Sterzik, the Examiner turns to Hong and the background section of the present application. However, the Examiner has not specifically pointed to where in the background section or in Hong the above missing limitations may be found. For example, no where in Hong would one find the words "scaling", "scaling value", "serial", "serial number". The Examiner is requested to point, by column number and line number, to where in the references these limitations may be found, or failing that, to withdraw the rejection.

Notwithstanding the above, there is a further difficulty with the combination put forth by the Examiner. At pages 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the office action the Examiner states, without support, that various things would supposedly be obvious to one skilled in the art, among them the view that it would supposedly be obvious to combine Sterzik and Hong. The undersigned notes that Sterzik

relates to computer power supplies, while Hong relates to battery-powered remote controllers. One skilled in the art of computer power supplies would not, it is suggested, turn to the art of battery-powered remote controllers. Applicant's attorney disagrees with the above view, and motivated by the case of *In re Ahlert and Kruger*, 165 USPQ 418 (CCPA 1970) Applicant's attorney hereby challenges this view and asks whether the Examiner can show support for the above combination.

The balance of this response will address various individual shortcomings of the present office action.

CLAIM 7

Claim 7 reads as follows, with letters added for convenient reference to particular limitations not found in any of the combination of prior art cited by Examiner:

> A system comprising at least [a] two power supply unit controllers for a rack enclosure in which a plurality of devices communicate via a backplane, each said controller comprising:
>
> means for reading at least one signal indicative of an output supply level being provided to said backplane by a power supply unit associated with said power supply unit controller;
>
> [b] memory for storing at least one value associated with a respective one of the at least one signal, [c] at least one scaling value associated with a respective one of the at least one signal and dependent on said power supply unit, and a [d] power supply unit serial number; and
>
> [e] communicating means, responsive to a request from one of said devices, for a returning a state of said associated power supply unit to said requesting device, said state including a combination of:
>
> a summary of the current status of the power supply unit,
>
> said at least one value,
>
> said at least one scaling value, and